

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 36, 39 and 40 were pending when last examined. Claims 1 – 36, 39 and 40 were rejected. Claim 1 is being amended. Claims 41 and 42 are being added. Claims 1 – 36 and 39 – 42 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected because of informalities. Claim 1 is being amended accordingly.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 was rejected for being indefinite. Claim 1 is being amended accordingly.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 3, 7, 23 – 25, 27 – 28, 31 – 33, and 35 – 36 and 39 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,961,587 to Vilppula et al. Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 is patentable over Vilppula et al, by at least reciting:

A modular wireless device comprising:
a shell that contains non-wireless components, at least one of which is system software; and
a cartridge that contains wireless components, at least one of which [[is]] comes from [[the]] a set of baseband and RF hardware; and
a means for the shell and cartridge to exchange configuration information; and
a means for the modular wireless device to configure its operation based on said configuration information.

Claim 1 is being amended to clarify that the wireless components includes baseband and/or RF hardware. As such, Vilppula et al. does not anticipate claim 1 as Vilppula et al. does not teach using baseband or RF hardware in a cartridge. Instead, Vilppula et al. at column 5, lines 51 – 67 cited by the Examiner, teaches that the SIM card (e.g., cartridge) can have software. In fact, it would be physically impossible to fit baseband and/or RF hardware in a SIM card due to size limitations. Therefore, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections. As claim 1 is patentable, its dependent claims should be patentable also at least by virtue of their dependency. Claims 41 and 42 are

being added with no new matter and should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the remaining sections of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 – 6, 8 – 22, 26, 29, 30, and 34. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency to allowable claims. As such, Applicant request withdrawal of the rejections.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Alfred Tom

Dated: 01/09/2007
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 843-3375
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By /Aaron Wininger, Reg. No. 45,229/
Aaron Wininger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,229